

The Nature of Human Disposition: al-Ghazālī's Contribution to an Islamic Concept of Personality

Abbas Husein Ali

***Abstract:** The paper provides a critique of contemporary psychological models of human nature and highlights the contribution of al-Ghazālī towards a better conceptualization of human disposition. A brief outline of the philosophical foundations of the three major psychological approaches—Freudian psychoanalysis, Skinnerian behaviorism, and Rogerian and Maslowian Humanism—are provided. Consequently, the metaphors they adopted for human nature are discussed. The paper also highlights the shortcomings of these models by looking at their practical implications, particularly for psychology of personality. The last part of the paper dwells on al-Ghazālī's contribution to an Islamic abstraction of human disposition and personality.*

Answering the question of what does it mean to be human lies at the heart of modern psychology. Many things depend on the way this question is answered; prominent among which are issues pertaining to the study of personality, meaning of life and purpose of creation. However, modern psychological literature shows that man has been a mystery to himself and the subject of human nature has proven to be a perplexing subject for many scholars.¹ But the problem is not a recent one—indeed, it is a problem that has occupied the best of human minds. Among them was Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī, whose extensive writings on this issue deserve more attention than what they have hitherto received.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to outline al-Ghazālī's methodology or his theory of knowledge. Only his views on human nature will be considered. Even this is not as simple as it may look. Al-

Dr. Abbas Husein Ali is Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, International Islamic University Malaysia.

Ghazālī treats the issue at hand in different books for, it seems, different purposes. These include his discourses as philosopher, a Sufi, a revivalist, or as someone who has gone through important stages of religious development. For the purpose of this paper, however, our account will focus on *Ihyā' ʿUlūm al-Dīn* (The Revivification of the Sciences of Religion).² In this book he gives a general survey with a cardinal religious and moral purpose. In the process, he elucidates his views of what does it mean to be human.

Philosophical Foundations of Modern Psychologies

All psychological approaches have as their starting points philosophies about what it means to be human. These philosophical beliefs have changed dramatically over time and differ among themselves. The central concern of psychologists, however, has remained the distinction between humans and nonhumans.

This demarcation is the essence of what has commonly been referred to as the "mind-body" problem in philosophy. The philosopher closely associated with this dilemma is René Descartes. However, some evidence seems to suggest that Descartes was greatly influenced by the writings of al-Ghazālī. A visit by a Tunisian scholar to Descartes's library in Paris revealed that he owned a translated copy of al-Ghazālī's book *al-Munqidh min al-Dalāl* with handwritten comments in the margins, one of which was "This should be adopted in our methodology."³

Hence humans were considered uniquely rational and had souls and many properties bestowed by God. Humans were also perceived as having bodies which are the sources of desires, passions and physical powers. The mode of relationship between the spiritual and the physical is one of interaction. Hence, there could be spirituality over materialism, and man's will is determined not by desires but by a rational purpose. This position clearly denotes a state of free will rather than determinism. Man can choose between the means of realizing good and his rationality entails action out of consent rather than compulsion. Such was the impact of Christian theology on science prior to Darwinism.⁴ Unfortunately, as we will show later, this issue of human rationality was inflated out of proportion with man being perceived as godlike.

What Darwin did was to shift attention to the anatomical structure of organisms and the concept of survival of the fittest and how it relates to evolution. But he also proposed mental continuity or mental evolution between humans and subhumans. Thus for Darwinism the difference between humans and nonhumans is a matter of degree rather than that of

kind. This had serious implications for psychological models of human nature. A good example is the assertion that humans differ from animals merely in that the former have more instincts, a belief held by many psychologists for quite some time. This conception of humanity led to the formulation of the metaphor *man as a machine*.⁵

Implications of Metaphorical Themes in Modern Psychology

The metaphors provided by Descartes and Darwin (man as a rational being versus man as a machine, respectively) were key historical antecedents to modern psychological attempts at answering the question of human nature. The associates of these metaphors could be categorized according to the following:

1. Men are all-knowing, all-just, all-powerful and loving (i.e., godlike);
2. Men's behavior is involuntary, performed without conscious awareness, predetermined, and fixed and routine (i.e., man as a machine).⁶

The two dominant metaphorical themes of man as a machine and man as godlike generated and subsumed a number of models on human nature in modern psychology. Following is a brief discussion pertaining to psychoanalysis, behaviorism, and humanistic psychologies.

Doubtless, the impact of Darwin's thought—his partial image of human nature—on Freud has been enormous. However, Freud was driven to his mechanistic view of human nature by a number of factors. Prominent among these were his training as a medical doctor; advances made in physics and biology, and by no means least, his atheism.

As a medical doctor Freud was trained to focus more on the anatomical structure of the body and to believe in Darwinism more than in Judaism. Furthermore, the spirit of his time and advances made in the physical sciences led him to construe the human body as a closed energy system that transforms energy into action. The following quotation from Holt, one of his students and followers, attests to this:

The concept of energy was a preoccupation of Freud's from the very beginning of his scientific work, considerably antedating any psychoanalytic model. When Freud was a student, energy was so much the rage, as stylish a concept as is information today, or perhaps even more so.⁷

So, in a clear similitude to the steam engine, man has been perceived

as being born with the *libido* (sexual energy) later to be trapped in between three compartments: the *id* which is highly instinctive and seeks immediate gratification of needs; the *ego* which is rational and always considers reality; and the *superego* representing morality and conscience. Hence, conflict is inevitable because of different interests particularly between the *id* and the *superego*. However, when these two elephants quarrel, the grass under their feet, the *ego*, is bound to suffer. The only way for the *ego* to protect itself is to resort to defence mechanisms such as fantasy, sublimation repression, and the like, using the safety valve to release some of the steam. Defence mechanisms actually mean dealing with impulses in a disguised way; in other words, the *ego* cheats both the *id* and the *superego*. The ultimate result is an unconscious full of unfinished business (impulses) which will later cause trouble to the individual.

The behaviorists, on the other hand, dealt only with objective forms of behaviour, feeling that they would risk lapses into irrationality if they considered much else. Consequently, they studied only that which is outside human beings. Hence, by extrapolating from experiments conducted on animals, Skinner concluded that humans do function in an orderly fashion, just like robots or machines.

The roots of radical behaviorism could safely be traced back to Hobbesian philosophy and the continuity from infrahumans to humans advocated by Darwinism. Hobbes, much impressed by the scientific knowledge of his age, conceived of the universe as a vast mechanical order. To him the universe is but a huge machine that operates according to principles easily accessible to the human mind. He was particularly interested in the issue of cause and effect and to him man is nothing but a machine. "For what is the heart, but a spring; and the nerves, but so many strings; and the joints, but so many wheels, giving motion to the whole body."⁸

The position of the Skinnerian radical behaviorism as regards human nature echoes the Hobbesian mechanistic view with greater emphasis on environmental determinism. Skinner's book *Beyond Freedom and Dignity* in this respect, speaks for itself.

This machine metaphor dominated psychology during the period 1930-1955. The second half of the decade of the 1950's witnessed what could be called the cognitive revolution in psychology. The spirit of the time was largely influenced by the advent of information theory and computer models. Hence, once again the machine metaphor was called into action, this time with some modifications to suit technological advances.

Consequently, cognitive psychologists construed man as a limited-capacity information processing channel with the human brain largely equated with the computer.

Such mass dehumanization in psychoanalysis and behaviorism lead to the third force in psychology, the humanistic approach. In reaction to the biological determinism of psychoanalysis, and the environmental determinism of the behaviorist, the humanists advocated a stance of non-determinism. They emphasized abilities of human to create and direct their own destinies. To them we are not created, it seems, by any being, nor did we evolve from anything. We are extremely free and are required only to endow life with personal meaning. Humans have limitless capacity for growth and self-improvement; in a nutshell, man is his own god. Consequently, the aim of the humanist is to spend time and effort on explaining what a person is capable of doing, more than talking about what he/she is.

Foundations for the humanistic approach are found in the works of John Dewey in America and the atheistic existentialism of Sartre in Europe. Sartre was obsessed with the concept of "freedom" and to him the only limit to human freedom is that one can not stop being free. The major concern for the Deweyan philosophy, on the other hand, is the development of the capacities of the individual to the maximum possible level: self-actualization, which is a central concept in the works of the key figures of humanistic psychology.

However, if the idea of freedom is to be held important, the Darwinian image of human nature, biological determinism, can hardly be regarded as an appropriate one. Similarly, the notion of environmental determinism evident in the behaviorist model is clearly discordant. To them the cognitive approach is still too restrictive which induced their adoption of the second major metaphor of man as god; and thus psychology became a religion or a secular cult of the self.⁹

The humanistic approach to the study of psychology meant to many of its adherents adoption of a secular kind of humanism and rejection of God, coupled with complete commitment to the concept of the *self*. Freedom is the driving force that energizes human action, with the ultimate goal of life being *self-esteem* and *self-actualization*. The momentum for this model of man was boosted by the fact that the economies of the industrialized nations began to need consumers. Consequently, "selfism's clear advocacy of experience now, and its rejection of inhibition or repression, was a boon to the advertising industry."¹⁰ Hence, rejection of the two deterministic views of

psychoanalysis and behaviorism bred yet another extreme position of humanism.

Implications of the Three Images of Man

Psychoanalysis is now part of the history of psychology. It proved to be of little value when its functional usefulness is considered. Radical behaviorism is also falling out of favor because of its highly mechanistic view of humanity. For one thing Skinner failed to answer the question: If behavior is controlled by the environment, who then, controls the controller?

Assumptions of the self as God, however, are rampant in the industrialized societies and particularly in the United States of America. At one time a special task force was formed in California to raise the level of children's self-esteem. This was particularly because low levels of self-esteem were singled out as the culprit and the cause for a wide range of psychosocial problems ranging from drug abuse and teenage pregnancies to low mathematical abilities and dropping out of school.¹¹ However, no scientific research supports the utility of this construct as a valid and reliable predictor of human behavior.¹² If anything, a belief in oneself as God generates a number of negative consequences, as in the following.

First, focusing on our selves feeds unrealistic self-love with many adverse psychological consequences, narcissism and self-deception to say the least. An international study showed that American students (high in self-esteem) scored well below their Korean counterparts in a test of mathematical skills. But when researchers asked the students to rate how good they were at mathematics, the Americans ranked the highest in self-judged mathematical ability, while the Koreans ranked the lowest.¹³

Second, teachings of the self-worship cult with its clear antireligious stance have some serious consequences for childrearing practices and the family. Their image of human nature asserts that children are "... natural, spontaneous, undefensive, curious, and, in their way, creative to an extent greater than the typical adult or older child."¹⁴ However, this does not account for the fact that children are also "...often irritable, impulsive, short-sighted, aggressive, egocentric, and bound by physiological needs."¹⁵

It seems that the mission of the post-Freudian era has generally become the satisfaction and immediate gratification of every impulse. Values and the meaning of situations are personally defined and any

attempt towards moral inhibition is bad for the process of self-actualization and will be hard on self-esteem. Hence, self-actualization is not merely a descriptive term but a moral one with self-actualization being construed as something valued and to be sought after. Consequently, there is no room for adults to guide or inculcate any value system in their children.

As for the family, the values and concepts of the humanistic approach to human nature have equally serious consequences. These not only relate to the principles of forming and establishing a family, but to maintenance of such long-lasting relationships. Thus, in the name of growth, autonomy and self-actualization, marriage is worth continuing, according to Rogers, only as long as it continues to be "...an enhancing, growing experience for each person."¹⁶ But, as questioned by Wallace and Wallace, one wonders what will happen when one's spouse becomes ill or when children come into existence.¹⁷ No wonder then, the divorce rate among the supposedly highly self-actualized nations such as the United States of America is surging up quite dramatically and when it goes down, it does so only because the new meaning assigned to the family leads to a clear drop in marriage rates. Separations among partners living according to the newly-developed and widely adhered to concept of "nonbinding commitment" of partnership are not considered divorces.

Finally, the assumption that human beings are intrinsically good is questionable. Many social events, both historical and contemporary, attest to the falsehood of this assumption. Wars and atrocities committed against fellow human beings in the Middle East, Bosnia, Chechnia, and Kashmir are a few examples. Surely low self-esteem can hardly be accepted as the culprit for the first crime of homicide committed on earth by the son of Adam.

Al-Ghazālī's Contribution to an Islamic Concept of Personality

Al-Ghazālī realized centuries ago that discussion of the issue of human nature forces one immediately to address metaphysical issues. Throughout his works he insists on the limitations of the theoretical *reason*, while he acknowledges the role of the *will*, and religious and moral *experiences* in efforts to access knowledge. To him any account of the nature of human nature, the mold in which humans are created, cannot be fully appreciated without an understanding of the purpose of creation and meaning of the present life. Allah (SWT) states in the holy Qur'ān: "I have only created jinns and men that they may serve Me." (51:56)

Consequently, with Allah being All-Just, Most Gracious and Most Merciful, humans were fashioned in the best of molds possible to suit the purpose of their creation. It is bemusing that this issue of the purpose of creation has never been addressed by the secular personality psychologists. One would assume that a better understanding of anything necessitates knowledge of its purpose of existence.

Al-Ghazālī views man as being endowed with two qualities peculiar to man, namely *knowledge* and *will*. This is because man possesses dual nature, physical and spiritual.¹⁸ The body serves as the vehicle for the soul, and the soul is the home for knowledge. It is the soul then that drives a person closer to Allah or away from Him. According to a *ḥadīth qudsī*, Allah (SWT) says that, "He who approaches me by a span, I approach him by a cubit."¹⁹ In another prophetic tradition the Prophet (SAS) is reported to have said, "Had it not been that the devils hover around the eyes of men, they would have seen the glories of the kingdom of the heavens and earth."²⁰ Consequently, the quality of knowledge lifts man to the heavenly world, or degrade him to the level of beasts. The physical and spiritual nature of man consists of four elements, manifesting themselves in four attributes. These include the beastly, the brutal, the satanic, and the divine. Put in psychological terms these correspond to: appetite, passion, arrogance, and the divine reason which can subjugate and conquer all the previous three. When man heeds the dictates of divine reason he finds God in his heart. That is why "heart" is such an important construct in Islamic system; according to a prophetic tradition, "there is a piece of flesh in the body, if it becomes reformed, the whole body is reformed, but if it gets spoilt, the whole body is spoilt; and that is heart."²¹

Al-Ghazālī elucidates this dual nature further by defining four terms of *qalb* (heart), *nafs* (soul or self), *rūḥ* (spirit), and *‘aql* (intellect). These four terms refer to four physical entities. However, when denoting the spiritual component they refer to one thing, namely "...a spiritual subtlety (*latīfah al-rūḥānīyah*), a thing created, but immortal; it is not measured in terms of extent in space and time, or of quantity; it is conscious of itself and is the locus of the intelligible; and the way to know it is only through intellect and by means of observing the activities that originate in it."²²

In a physical sense the heart refers to the conical-shaped piece of flesh on the left side of the chest, the function of which is blood circulation. It is found in all animals. *Nafs* in the material sense refers to the animalistic powers outlined above. These are the enemies within to which

the holy Prophet was alluding when he spoke of the greater *jihād*. Similarly, the *rūh* means a vapourous substance which issues from the material heart and covers every part of the body. It resembles a lamp placed in a house to shed light throughout it. Finally, the intellect helps in abstraction in dealing with the physical world and it is localized in the brain.²³

Individual differences result from the qualitative changes that take place at the spiritual level (*ahwāl*). When the self is overriding and subjugating the animalistic passions, it is called *al-nafs al-mutma'innah*. When it upbraids man and berates itself, it is called *al-nafs al-lawwāmah* (conscience). When it incites to evil and freely indulges in the gratification of man's passions it is called *al-nafs al-ammārah bi al-su'*.

Thus far al-Ghazālī's contribution rests on the way he has reiterated what his predecessors, both Muslims and non-Muslims, had said earlier. His more valuable contribution, however, lies in the way he comprehends perception, emotion, motivation, and consequently personality vis á vis the dual nature of man.

According to al-Ghazālī, perception, cognition, affection, emotion, motivation, and consequently behaviour all depend on the spiritual state of the person. This is because personality as construed by al-Ghazālī, includes an outward form (physical) and an inward self (spiritual). The physical form (body) is perceived by the vision of the eyes, while the spiritual self perceives by means of the insight. To him, however, "the soul which perceives by means of the insight is of greater value than the body which perceives by means of the eyes."²⁴ To this spiritual entity he reserves, in many of his writings, the term *heart*. He asserts that the heart is the real essence of man which differentiates him from infra-humans, "...for the heart is that which knows God, which approaches unto Him, works for Him, and strives after Him."²⁵

Hence, the heart performs some significant perceptual, cognitive, and motivational tasks. This is basically because it is "a divine thing, a ray from the light of God, a spark from the Eternal Flame and within it and to it is revealed the Ultimate Reality, the image of the Whole, so that it, too, is filled with the Divine Light and manifests it forth."²⁶ Consequently, the spiritually-minded see with their hearts with greater effect and more accuracy than those who see with their outward (physical) eyes.²⁷ In this conjunction the holy Qur'an asserts that:

Do they not travel through the land, so that their hearts (and minds) may thus learn wisdom and their ears may thus learn to hear? Truly,

it is not their eyes that are blind, but their hearts which are in their breasts. (22:46)

Similarly, there is a spiritual hearing:

Many of the jinn and men we have made for hell: they have hearts wherewith they understand not, eyes wherewith they see not, and ears wherewith they hear not; they are like cattle, nay more misguided: for they are heedless. (7:179)

Those who have their spiritual hearing dulled share their outward hearing faculty with other animals. While to the spiritually minded, all the sounds in the surroundings, including those of the birds, the winds, and the waves are but clear signs of the greatness of the Creator and bear witness to the unicity of God and are praising Him with articulate tongues.²⁸ To this kind of people, the whole world is but a huge mosque.²⁹

It is of paramount importance to note that, although al-Ghazālī gives due consideration to man's rational and intellectual properties, he does not place an excessive reliance on them, and never considers it sufficient for controlling human desires and urges. Rather, it is faith which draws man closer to human merit and excellence and raises him to the exalted status of being Allah's vicegerent.

Al-Ghazālī's Contribution to Personality Theory

In his writings, al-Ghazālī has addressed a number of valuable points that are vital to the development of a clear concept of the human personality. Inspired by some fundamental understanding of the meaning of present life, with holy prophets as the models to be followed, he explicitly discusses a number of issues that bear clear relevance to the psychology of personality. He examines the issue of nature versus nurture, and how these potent factors could possibly influence personality. Al-Ghazālī also deals with the issue of past and present events in human life and their relative importance in shaping our personalities. Furthermore, he outlines a very sound approach to child rearing practices. Each of these merits an independent study. Nevertheless, we will briefly highlight the views particularly germane to the psychology of personality.

Nature Versus Nurture

For quite some time psychologists have been dealing with the perplexing

issue pertaining to the relative importance of biological and environmental factors in shaping human behavior. This is commonly known as the nature/nurture debate and is widely acknowledged as the longest war in the history of psychology. Psychoanalysts strongly support a naturalistic stance, while the behaviorists emphasize the role of nurture. The humanists believe that man is fundamentally good. However, they seem to focus on material and physical goodness, as mentioned above. This is evident in the works of Maslow, who reviewed the autobiographies of some personalities who, in his view, exemplify the best models in the history of humanity. Their spirituality or religiosity was never considered as a manifestation of their success or as an imperative prerequisite to attain the stage of self-actualization. In fact even drug pushers may qualify to realizing the stage of self-actualization if one is to adopt the Maslovian criteria.

Regarding al-Ghazālī's conceptualization based on revelation and on prophetic tradition, the essence of man is spiritual goodness. However, the environment is equally important in preserving or spoiling the purity of the human soul.

Table: A comparison between al-Ghazālī's assumptions about human nature and those of modern psychologies

	<i>al-Ghazālī</i>	<i>Freud</i>	<i>Skinner</i>	<i>Rogers</i>
<i>Central concept</i>	Man is of dual nature	Unconscious experiences	SR units	Self-actualization
<i>Locus of influence</i>	Spiritual (internal)	Biological (unconscious)	Environmental (external)	Self (internal)
<i>Nature/nurture</i>	Spiritual goodness	Man is evil by nature	Man has no nature	Man is good by nature
<i>Freewill vs. determinism</i>	Freewill	Deterministic	Deterministic	Free will
<i>Historical emphasis</i>	Past, present, and future (hereafter)	Past	Irrelevant	Here and now

Freewill Versus Determinism

One significant point in al-Ghazālī's image of human nature deals with the problematic issue in modern psychology of free will versus determinism. As for al-Ghazālī, it is man who holds the balance between determinism and freedom. The uniform succession of events is predetermined, but man's *ikhtiyār* is an essential element of his own will. As eloquently argued by Al-Attas,³⁰ *ikhtiyār* does not simply mean choice, rather, it is bound in meaning with its root *kh-y-r* which implies good. Thus opting for a bad choice is not *ikhtiyār*. Consequently, an individual through faith in God brings about deliberate and decisive reduction in the pressure of the animalistic urges which, in turn, liberates him or her from the terrible grip of any biological or environmental forces.

Historical Emphasis

Al-Ghazālī's writings on childhood and child rearing practices are certainly relevant to the issue of the importance of childhood experiences in shaping man's personality. Psychoanalysts put much emphasis on early childhood. Freud believes that an individual's personality is established by the end of the first five or six years of life. Hence, past experience is decisive and final in shaping the way an individual thinks, feels or behaves. The time factor is of no importance in the case of behaviorism. What is more important is whether an experience is reinforced or not. Humans are capable of learning, unlearning, or relearning. The humanists give greater consideration to adult experiences.

Al-Ghazālī, however, looks at personality development as a process where childhood is perceived as a training ground for the purpose of creation, *taklif*. His perspective is indeed more comprehensive, relegating secular approaches to a position reminiscent of the story about the elephant and the blind men. To him, an individual's personality will be influenced from the moment he or she was conceived, moving to the way he or she was breastfed and weaned. Al-Ghazālī was not much concerned with the superficial issue of how the child is fed, but rather puts his emphasis on the source of sustenance itself: whether food was acquired by parents or guardians through lawful means. Thus, every possible step should be taken to ensure that the struggle between evil and good, the sacred and the profane, in the human personality should always culminate in the establishment of virtues and in the annihilation of vices.

Al-Ghazālī urges parents to educate rather than dictate their children.

With strong affectionate bonds between them and their children, parents should make firm moral demands on their children. They should use extrinsic methods of reward and punishment only during childhood to pave the way for intrinsic ones by adolescence. Furthermore, parents should strive to punish psychologically rather than physically in order to induce feelings of remorse and guilt rather than fear and anger.

Conclusions

To conclude, the table above summarizes the crucial points by which one may compare and contrast al-Ghazālī's assumptions on the nature of human personality with those prevalent in modern psychological knowledge. It is quite clear that al-Ghazālī's understanding was comprehensive indeed. It also enjoys a great degree of consistency and functional usefulness. For instance, it proves to be of greater value if used to explain, control or predict human behavior.³¹ This is not puzzling, of course, since it incorporates what is missing from the models of man depicted by secular scholars, namely the spiritual component. It is this essence which permeates all the essential constituents of the human personality to produce the positive characteristic one is capable of displaying at affective, cognitive, and behavioral levels.

Notes

1. See, for example, L. Stevenson, *Seven Theories of Human Nature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987); N. Chaney, *Six Images of Human Nature* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1990); and L.S. Wrightsman, *Assumptions About Human Nature: Implications for Researchers and Practitioners* (London: Sage Publications, 1992).
2. Abū Hamid al-Ghazālī, *Ihyā' 'ulūm al-dīn* (Beirut: Dār al-Ma'rifah, n.d.).
3. Yusuf al-Qaradāwī, *al-Imām al-Ghazālī bayna mādhīhi wa nāqidīhi* (al-Ghazālī Between his Proponents and Opponents) (Cairo: Maktabat Wahbah, 1993).
4. A. Korman, *The Psychology of Motivation* (Englewoods Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974).
5. B. Weiner, *Motivation: Metaphors, Theories, and Research* (London: Sage Publications, 1992).

6. Weiner, *Motivation*.
7. Quoted by C. N. Coefer and M.H. Appley, *Motivation: Theory and Research* (New York: Wiley, 1964) 596.
8. Quoted by Chaney in *Six Images*.
9. P. Vitz, *Psychology as Religion: The Cult of Self-worship* (Carlisle: The Paternoster Press, 1994).
10. Ibid.
11. See "The Curse of Self-Esteem," *Newsweek*, 17 Feb. 1992.
12. S. Black, "Self-esteem: Sense and Nonsense," *American School Board Journal*, July 1991, 27-29.
13. A. LaPointe, N.A. Mead, and G. Philips, *A World of Difference: An International Assessment of Mathematics and Science* (Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1989).
14. Vitz, *Psychology as Religion*.
15. Ibid.
16. C. Rogers quoted by M. Wallace and L. Wallace in *Psychology's Sanction for Selfishness: The Error of Egotism in Theory and Therapy* (San Francisco: Freeman, 1983) 160.
17. Ibid.
18. S.M.N. al-[°]Attās, *The Nature of Man and the Psychology of the Human Soul* (Kuala Lumpur: International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization, 1990).
19. *Sahīḥ al-Bukhārī, Kitāb al-Tauḥīd*.
20. *Musnad Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal* vol 2, 353, 363.
21. *Sahīḥ al-Bukhārī, Kitāb al-Īmān*.
22. Al-Attas, *The Nature of Man*, 7.
23. al-Ghazālī, *Ma[°]ārij al-quds fī ma[°]rifat madārij al-naḥs* (Beirut: Dar al-Āfāq al-Jadīdah, 1978).
24. al-Ghazālī *Ihyā'* 3: 46
25. al-Ghazālī, *Ihyā'* 3: 2.
26. al-Ghazālī, *Ihyā'*, 3: 350.
27. al-Ghazālī, *Ihyā'* 4: 26, also see p.431.
28. al-Ghazālī, *Ihyā'* 2: 218-219.
29. Mālik Badrī *al-Tafakkur min al-mushāhadah ilā al-shuhūd* (Contemplation from Witnessing to Bearing Witness) (Herndon, Virginia: International Institute of Islamic Thought, 1993).
30. al-[°]Attās, *The Nature of Man*.
31. [°]Abbās H. [°]Alī, "al-Sulūk al-insānī bayna tanzīl al-Raḥmān wa [°]āql al-insān" (Human behaviour between reason and revelation), Paper presented at the International Seminar on Islamization of Knowledge. Gezira University, Sudan, Feb 2-5, 1995.